

Before The
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

MAY 17 1996

In the Matter of)

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Implementation of the Local Competition)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Provisions in the Telecommunications Act)
of 1996)

CC Docket No. 96-98

TO: The Commission

ERRATUM

The Competitive Telecommunications Association ("CompTel"), by its counsel, hereby submits this erratum to correct inadvertent errors appearing in the Table of Contents for the comments which CompTel filed yesterday in the above-captioned proceeding. The corrected version of the Table of Contents is attached, and CompTel has included the corrected version in the service copies of its comments. We also will provide the Commission with a new diskette containing the corrected version of the Table of Contents.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Robert J. Aamo
Wendy I. Kirchick
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay
1301 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1100 - East Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 414-9210

Counsel for Competitive
Telecommunications Association

May 17, 1996

No. of Copies rec'd 01/6
List ABCDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
SUMMARY	1
I. MINIMUM NATIONAL RULES	1
II. UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS AND LOCAL EXCHANGE RESALE	2
III. EXCHANGE ACCESS	4
IV. PRICING	6
INTRODUCTION	7
1. Do The Right Thing Now	7
2. Interpret The Act According To Its Language	8
3. Avoid Going "Back To The Future"	9
4. Err On The Side Of New Entry And Competition	9
5. Rules Can Be Pro-Competitive And Deregulatory	10
6. Congress Has Established A New Paradigm	10
7. The Ultimate Litmus Test Is "Does It Work?"	11
8. The 1996 Act Affects All Markets	11
9. Do Not Prejudge Outcomes ..	12
10. Bargaining Leverage Is Unequal	12
I. THE FCC MUST ADOPT EXPLICIT NATIONAL RULES TO IMPLEMENT SECTION 251 OF THE 1996 ACT	13
A. The FCC Has Authority to Adopt Minimum National Rules Implementing Section 251	13
B. The 1996 Act Gives The FCC Jurisdiction Over The Co-Carrier Services And Facilities Subject To Section 251 On An Unseparated Basis	15

C.	The 1996 Act Strikes a Balance Between The FCC's And The States' Roles in Implementing Section 251	16
D.	Explicit National Rules Implementing Section 251 Are Both Pro-Competitive and Deregulatory	19
II.	THE FCC SHOULD ADOPT RULES SPECIFYING THE NECESSARY UNBUNDLED NETWORK ELEMENTS AND REQUIRING ILECS TO PROVIDE THE NECESSARY OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS AND SUPPORT	23
A.	Section 251(c)(3) Is An Essential Option For Carriers to Enter the Local Market	24
B.	The FCC Must Establish Equivalent Entry Options for ILECs and Long Distance Carriers	26
C.	The FCC Should Require ILECs To Engage In The Unbundling of Necessary Network Elements	30
D.	The FCC Should Require ILECs to Unbundle Local Switching Capacity, Not Merely a Port	33
E.	The FCC Should Adopt a ULS Rate Structure To Reflect How The ILECs Incur Switching Costs	35
F.	The FCC Should Require ILECs To Price Unbundled Loops On A Flat-Rate Basis	36
G.	The FCC Should Establish Industry Standards For Operational and Back- Office Systems	37
H.	The FCC Should Clarify that Requesting Carriers May Obtain Any or All Network Elements from ILECs	38
I.	The FCC Should Clarify That A Carrier Can Purchase Unbundled Network Elements From An ILEC To Provide Any Telecommunications Service	39

J.	The FCC Should Establish Non-Exclusive Procedures For The Ongoing Implementation of Section 251(c)(3)	40
K.	The FCC Should Adopt Rules Regarding Points Of Interconnection That Are Technically Feasible	41
L.	The FCC Should Adopt Rules Requiring ILECs To Unbundle The Advanced Intelligent Network	42
M.	The FCC Should Create Transport Elements That Mirror Its Local Transport Rate Structure	45
N.	The FCC Should Establish A Strict Policy Of Nondiscrimination Under Section 251(c)	46

III. THE FCC SHOULD NOT INJECT SERVICE OR CARRIER RESTRICTIONS INTO SECTION 251(C) WHICH CONGRESS DID NOT EXPRESSLY DECREE48

A.	Section 251(c)(2) Enables Telecommunications Carriers To Obtain Exchange Access From ILECs Through Co-Carrier Interconnection Arrangements	49
B.	Interpreting Section 251(c)(2) to Prohibit Carriers From Obtaining Exchange Access For Their Own Long Distance Services Is Impractical and Unsustainable	52
C.	Section 251(i) Does Not Affect The Proper Interpretation of Section 251(c)(2)	56
D.	The FCC Should Adopt The Fundamental Principle That All Carriers Purchasing The Same Facility Or Service From The Same ILEC Should Pay The Same Rate	60
E.	The Statutory References to "Telephone Exchange Service and Exchange Access" Does Not Mean That Requesting Carriers Must Provide Both or Neither	62
F.	Carriers Are Entitled To Obtain Exchange Access For Their Own Long Distance Services Through Co-Carrier Arrangements Under Section 251(c)(3)	64

G.	Section 252(i) Confirms That Congress Intended For All Carriers to Obtain Exchange Access for Their Own Long Distance Services Through Co-Carrier Arrangements Under Section 251(c)	66
H.	Section 251(c)(2) Does Not Apply To The Mere "Physical Linking" of Facilities	66
IV.	THE FCC SHOULD ADOPT TSLRIC AS A MANDATORY NATIONAL COSTING STANDARD TO IMPLEMENT THE REQUIREMENT FOR RATES BASED ON ECONOMIC COST UNDER SECTIONS 251(C) AND 252(D)	67
A.	The 1996 Act Requires The FCC To Adopt TSLRIC For Interconnection and Unbundled Network Elements Under Section 251(c)	69
B.	The FCC Should Prohibit All TSLRIC-Plus Methodologies	71
C.	Price Cap Regulation Is Unlawful For Co-Carrier Arrangements Under Section 251(c)	74
D.	The FCC Should Consider Establishing Benchmark Rates or Proxies As a Reliable Mechanism For Achieving Nationwide TSLRIC-Based Rates	76
E.	The FCC Should Not Adopt or Permit Ramsey Pricing for Rates under Section 251(c)	79
F.	The FCC Should Prohibit non-TSLRIC Volume and Term Discounts under Section 251(c)	80
V.	THE FCC MUST ADOPT AN INTERIM PLAN FOR EXCHANGE ACCESS OBTAINED ON A STAND-LINE BASIS UNDER SECTION 251(C)	81
VI.	THE FCC SHOULD ADOPT THE MINIMUM RULES NECESSARY TO ENSURE THAT CARRIERS CAN OBTAIN LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICE AT MEANINGFUL WHOLESALE RATES WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS	88
A.	Meaningful Wholesale Local Exchange Rates Are Essential For A Competitive Full-Service Market	88
B.	Local Entry Through Local Exchange Resale Will Promote Efficient Facilities-Based Entry	91

C.	The FCC Should Adopt Rules Requiring ILECs to Remove All Retail Costs From Their Wholesales Rates	94
D.	The FCC Should Establish A Methodology For Measuring Avoided Retail Costs	96
E.	The FCC Should Consider Establishing Benchmark Wholesale Reductions For Local Exchange Resale Under Sections 251(c)(4) and 252(d)(3)	99
F.	The FCC Should Prohibit Any Restrictions Upon Wholesale Local Exchange Services That Congress Has Not Authorized Expressly in the 1996 Act.	100

**VII. THE FCC SHOULD ADOPT OTHER RULES AND POLICIES
NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT SECTION 251 OF THE
1996 ACT**

102

A.	The FCC Should Clarify that State Commissions May Order ILECs to Tariff Their Co-Carrier Arrangements Under Section 251(c)	102
B.	The FCC Should Continue To Adresse Complaints Pursuant to Section 208	103
C.	The FCC Should Require ILECs to Submit All Agreements Negotiated Prior To The 1996 Act	104
D.	The FCC Should Adopt A Single Set of Rules That Govern Generally Available Terms and Conditions	105
E.	The FCC Should Adopt Rules To Implement The Nondiscrimination Principle In Section 252(i)	105
F.	The FCC Should Adopt The Policy That Interested Parties May Participate As of Right In Arbitration And Review Proceeding	108